UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/467,818	12/20/1999	VIJITHA SENAKA KIRIDENA	199-0680	2860

28549 7590 03/24/2004

KEVIN G. MIERZWA
ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.
28333 TELEGRAPH ROAD, SUITE 250
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48034

EXAMINER	
DASTOURI, MEHRDAD	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2623	16

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/467,818	KIRIDENA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mehrdad Dastouri	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 December 2003*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2 and 4-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 2 and 4-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

ETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicants' amendment filed December 4, 2003, has been entered and made of record.

2. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue in essence that prior art of record (Akinori) does not disclose causing a second portion of a mosaic to be displayed in response to a vehicle attribute. Applicants further argue that Akinori does not generate a second portion of a mosaic in response to a vehicle attribute, and does not generate a mosaic image through the acquisition and combination of multiple images.

The examiner disagrees and indicates that generation of a mosaic image through the acquisition and combination of multiple images has been disclosed by primary prior art of record (Ramakesavan). Akinori, as well teaches generating mosaic images (synthesized backward supervisory picture image as indicated in Akinori's invention abstract. As depicted in Figure 8 of Akinori's invention, mosaic images w1 and w2 are created and Akinori displays the second portion of mosaic image (image w1) in response to the monitored attribute (rear wheel moving locus).

The prior arts of record are all in the same field on endeavor and directed to moving vehicles data acquisition and display, and consequently combinable.

Applicants further remarks concerning Claims 11-13, 17 and 19 indicate analogous arguments as stated above, and the same responses are applicable accordingly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. IO3(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan, US 6184781, and Henley, US 5657073, further in view of Akinori, JP 10175482

As per Claim 1, Ramakesavan teaches:

at least two image acquisition apparatuses (digital carreras, Figure 1, elements 12a and 12b, Column 1, Lines 62-65 or Figure 5, Column 2, Lines 32-35) which are disposed upon a vehicle (front corners of vehicle, Figure 1, elements 12a and 12b) and which acquire images of the environment in which said vehicle resides (Figure 1, Column 1, Lines 19-23);

a video processing assembly (Figure 5, element 14) which is coupled to said at least two image acquisition apparatuses, which receives said acquired images, and which uses said acquired images to create ("stitching") a mosaic image of said environment (Column 2, Lines 13-15, 40-57, Figure 6, element 16);

a djsplay (Figure 10, element 11), which is coupled to said video processing assembly (Figure 10, element 14), which is disposed within said vehicle (Column 2, Lines 31-33),

Although Ramakesavan does teach a display coupled to the video processor within the vehicle, which clearly will display a portion of the mosaic, Ramakesavan does not

specifically teach "selectively' displaying a portion. However, Henley, who creates panoramic images (Abstract, Column 2, Lines40-41, 43-44, 55-67), teaches:

which selectively displays at least one portion of said mosaic (Column 2, Lines 45-48); and

an image control assembly (pan-tilt-rotation-zoom controller, Figure 2A, element 22) which selects (via joy stick or other pointing device, e.g. finger, Column 4, Lines 52-53) said at least one portion (Column 4, Lines 51-57, in particular, 54-57), thereby allowing said at least one portion of said mosaic to be selectively displayed by said display assembly (Figure 2A, element 30, Column 4, Lines 58-61).

Although Ramakesavan teaches monitoring the travel path and location of vehicle to detect when another vehicle is along side (Figure 4, Column 2, Lines 28-30), which would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a trigger such as a car running along side the vehicle direct the system to focus more closely to that portion of the image data displayed.

Neither Ramakesavan nor Henley specifically teach causing a second portion of the mosaic to be displayed. However, Akinori teaches:

wherein said vehicle has at least one attribute (car speed, rear wheel moving locus, first sentence of solution section of Abstract) and wherein said assembly selectively monitors said at least one attribute and, in response to said monitored attribute, generates a certain signal (steering angle, last sentence of A~) which is effective to cause a second portion (another direction, last sentence of Abstract)of said mosaic (synthesized backward supervisory picture image) to be displayed by said display assembly.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to selectively point at

regions of interest in mosaic image, as does Henley in combination with the image collection system of Ramakesavan and Akinori so as to better advise the operator about hazards to the side and rear of a vehicle. Also, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to look at how others in the same field of endeavor would solve similar problems.

As per Claim 2, Ramakesavan teaches

wherein said at least two image acquisition apparatuses each comprise a camera (digital cameras, Figure 1 elements 12a and 12b, Column 1, Lines 62-65 or Figure 5, Column 2, Lines 32-35).

As per Claim 4, Akinori teaches:

The vehicle data acquisition and display assembly of Claim 1 wherein said vehicle is selectively maneuvered (see Figure 8, Solution section of Abstract) and wherein said assembly senses said maneuvering of said vehicle and, in response to said sensed maneuvering, causes a third portion (Figure 8, wl, w2, etc as vehicle turns) of said mosaic to be displayed by said display assembly.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the triggers of Akinori (change in driving direction or steering) to substitute as the input to the controller of Henley to the image data presented by Ramakesavan to provide an accurate depiction of what is behind the vehicle at a particular moment in time.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. IO3(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan, Henley and Akinori as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Kiridena et al. (hereinafter Kiridena), US 6429789.

As per Claim (5), Kiridena teaches:

The vehicle acquisition and display assembly of Claim 4 further comprising a voice activated control assembly (microphone, Column 6, Lines 27 -35) which selectively receives at least one voice command and which selectively causes a fourth portion (region of interest) of said mosaic to be displayed ("created" region of interest, Column 6, Lines 32-35) in response to said at least one voice command.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the voice inputs of Kiridena to further augment the image display system to allow for additional image data to be presented for the system of Ramakesavan, Henley and Akinori that already monitors vehicle closeness to objects, steering angles, and vehicle speed to control image data to also allow for the user to specify desired image views.

6. Claims 6 -9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. IO3(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan, Henley and Akinori as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Hassinger, US 3915385.

Ramakesavan, Henley and Akinori do not specifically teach a way to keep the camera lenses clean. However, it would have been obvious to design such a system because the environment in which the automobile optical system is subjected to (snow and grime in the winter, if in the Northeast, rain, if in the Northwest or dust if in the Southwest) is harsh and to provide undistorted image data the camera lenses must be free of dirt, etc.

Ramakesavan clearly teaches:

at least one lens cover (a lens cover is clearly a part of any camera, Ramakesavan, Figure 1, elements 12a-c);

Hassinger teaches:

a lens cleaning assembly (Figure 1, element 16) which selectively cleans said at least one lens cover (Ffigure 1, element 14)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the lens cleaning system of Hassinger with the camera system of Ramakesavan, Henley and Akinori because Hassinger is familiar with keeping lenses on automobiles clean. Additionally such systems are already part of an automobile system, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use already designed off-the-shelf lens cleaning systems to provide unobstructed image acquisition.

As per Claim 7, Hassinger teaches:

wherein said lens cleaning assembly includes a source of compressed air (Figure 1, element 26); and a valve which selectively allows compressed air to be applied to said at least one lens cover (Figure 1, element 28).

As per Claim 8, Hassinger teaches:

wherein said lens cleaning assembly further includes a source of a cleansing agent (Figure 4, element 18, Column 6, Lines 23-32) which is selectively and concomitantly mixed (air and fluid are mixed in tank 18) with said applied compressed [air].

As per Claim 9, Hassigner teaches

wherein said cleaning agent is warmed before it is mixed with said applied compressed air (see Figure 1, element 18, which shows cleansing agent liquid located in the engine compartment of an automobile). Hassinger by locating the cleansing agent liquid in the engine compartment insures that the liquid will be wamled by the heat energy created by the engine.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the engine heat to elevate the temperature of the cleansing agent, at least, to prevent freezing of the cleansing solution in the line.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan, Henley and Akinori as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Wada.

As per Claim (10), neither Ramakesavan nor Henley teach an audio signal, however, Wada teaches:

comprising an audio assembly which selectively generates certain audio signals (to indicate a possible collision with obstacle, Column 7, Lines 50-57) which describe said at least one portion of said mosaic.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the audio signal as an alarm as does Wada in the vehicle camera system of Ramakesavan and Henley to prevent collisions with some object located to the rear or side of the vehicle.

8. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan, Henley, Akinori and Wada as applied to Claim 10 above, and further in view of Kiridena et al. (hereinafter Kiridena), US 6429789.

As per Claim 15, Kiridena teaches:

comprising a voice recognition module (Column 6, Lines 27-35) which causes said first portion of said cooperatively provided images to be displayed by said display assembly in response to a receipt of a certain voice command (Column 6, Lines 60-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the triggers of Kiridena (change in driving direction or steering) to substitute as the input from the joystick

controller of Henley to the image data presented by Ramakesavan and Wada to provide an accurate depiction of what is behind the vehicle at a particular moment in time.

9. Claims 11, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan, Henley and Akinori as applied to Claim 1 above and further in view of Schofield et al. (hereinafter Schofield), US 5949331, and Wright.

As per Claim 11, Ramakesaven teaches:

a plurality of cameras (Column 1, Lines 60-65); but Ramakesavan does not specifically teach that the cameras are along the roof line, but cameras 12a and 12b are equidistant.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, if they were deciding to implement Ramakesavan's system using only two cameras to place the cameras in locations that they would have a full field of view.

Also, Schofield teaches that the image data can be presented in abutting ("adjacent", Column 8, Lines5-6) images (Figure 8, Column 7, Line 66, Column 8, Line 10). Therefore the following limitation is taught by the combination of Ramakesavan and Schofield:

which are equidistantly disposed along at least two edges of said roof and which cooperatively provide images of the environment in which said vehicle resides (Schofield, figure 8) wherein said equidistant spacing of said cameras is effective to cause each provided from two spatially adjacent cameras to abut to cooperatively form a panoramic mosaic view;

Henley teaches:

a display assembly which selectively displays said mosaic view of said cooperatively provided images (Column 4, Lines 51-56); Ramakesavan, Henley nor Schofield teaches a touch sensitive surface.

However, Wright teaches

a controller having a touch sensitive surface (MobileVu, Column 3, Lines 46-48) upon which an icon (obvious to use icons in a graphical control panel, Column 3, Lines 56-57) is disposed,

Although Wright teaches changing camera images, Wright does not teach selecting another portion of an image to be viewed. However, Henley teaches this feature:

said controller selecting a first portion (Column 4, Lines 51-56) of said cooperatively provided images by use of said touch sensitive surface (which is an obvious functional substitution for a pointing device) and causing said selected first portion of said cooperatively provided images to be displayed by said display assembly.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the touch screen input device of Wright to control the imaging devices of Ramakesavan, Henley and Akinori as used by Schofield to minimize the space requirements of the system given the constraints of having the system located in an automobile, which already suffers from space constraints particularly when the vehicle is used in a law enforcement environment.

As per Claim 12, Ramakesavan, Henley, Akinori, Schofield nor Wright specifically

teaches that the cameras have an imaging surface substantially coplanar with a portion the roof.

However, many cameras have optics that reflects the incoming image at 90 degrees to the imaging surface. This is not a unique configuration for an image acquisition system and would merely be a design choice.

As per Claim 13, Henley teaches that the viewpoint can be changed to any arbitrary view point (Column 4, Lines 51-56). Therefore, Ramakesavan teaches wherein said cooperatively provided images include a first image which represents a first portion of the environment which is relatively far (rearview, Figure 1, Column 2, Lines 25-30) from said

vehicle and a second image which represents a second portion of said environment which is relatively close to said vehicle ("Flashing", Figure 12b, Column 2, Lines 25-30), said controller selecting said first image to be displayed upon said display assembly.

when said controller is touched at a point which is relatively far (Column 1, Lines 45-60) from said icon and selecting said second image to be displayed upon said display assembly when said controller is touched at a second point which is relatively close to said icon ("pan- tilt-rotation-zoom controller", Column 4, Lines 51-57, djsplay formats changed based upon selective use of the data/conunand input device).

Although Henley teaches using a joystick, Henley does not teach a touch screen, however, Wright teaches such a feature.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the touch screen to replace the input device of Henley to zoom in or otherwise manipulate the in-vehicle imaging systems of Ramakesavan, Henley, Akinori, Schofield to provide graphical control panel using data representations familiar to the user, such as icons. It also allows

the user to dynamically configuring the display to provide relevant information in a format most easily interpreted by the user.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. IO3(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan, Henley, Akinori, Schofield, and Wright, as applied to Claim 13 above, further in view of Kiridena.

Although, Wright teaches graphical user interfaces (Column 3, Lines 56-57) in which the use of icons is well known, none of the references applied to Claim 13 above specifically state that the icon is an image of a vehicle.

Applicant argues that an image of a vehicle must be one of the vehicles in the collected image, but the claim merely recites that the icon comprises "an image of a vehicle"; this can be a previously stored image, a cartoon image or possibly a real-time image collected by the on-board.

As per Claim 14, Kiridena teaches:

wherein said icon comprises an image of a vehicle (Column 11, Lines 29-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the icon representation as taught by Kiridena to provide the user graphical interface as taught by Wright in the system of Ramakesavan, Henley, and Schofield to provide an obvious representation of a point of interest so that the vehicle operator does not have to divert undue attention to inputting the correct information to get the desired image displayed.

11. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan, Henley, Akinori, Schofield, Wright and Kiridena, as applied to Claim 14 above, further in view of Wada.

As per Claim 16, Wada teaches:

comprising an audio generator which selectively generates certain sounds which are based upon said certain portion of said cooperatively provided images (Column 7, Lines 20-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the audio signal as an alarm as does Wada in the vehicle camera system of Ramakesavan, Henley, Akinori, Schofield, Wright, and Kiridena to prevent collisions with some object located to the rear or side of the vehicle. In addition, the audio signal can allow the user to hear that the operator has touched the correct icon.

12. Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. IO3(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan, Henley and Akinori as applied to Claim I above and further in view of Okude et al., (hereinafter Okude), US 6157342.

As per Claim 17, Ramakesavan teaches:

providing a plurality of cameras (Figure 5, elements 12a-c);

disposing said plurality of cameras upon said vehicle, effective to acquire said images (see Figure 1 for locations of cameras);

providing a display (Figure 5, element 1);

Although Ramakesavan does teach a display coupled to the video processor within the vehicle, which clearly will display a portion of the mosaic, Ramakesavan does not specifically teach "selectively displaying a portion. Henley creates panoramic images (A~ Column 2, 11 40-41, 43-44, 55-67). Akinori teaches:

disposing said display within said vehicle, effective to selectively display a seamless mosaic view from at least a portion of said images (Solution portion of A~); Henley teaches using a joystick to select images for display and control (Column 4, Lines

52-53). Neither Ramakesavan nor Henley nor Akinori teaches voice recognition. However, Okude teaches an automobile image display for driver navigation purposes. Okude teaches generating a voice command (Column 4, Lines 53-55);

and using said voice conunand to select said at least a portion of said images (cot 4, 11, 55-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skIll in the art to simplify the image display functions of Ramakesavan, Henley and Akinori by using the voice recognition control input features of the Okude automobile navigation display to allow for the driver to concentrate on monitoring his surrounding instead of being possibly distracted by having to interact with the system via a joy stick. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to look at both patents because both pertain to providing mosaic image information to a driver.

As per Claim 19, Ramakesavan teaches:

wherein each of said cameras are substantially identical (see figure 5, elements 12a-c, Column 2, Lines 33-35)

13. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramakesavan, Henley, Akinori and Okude as applied to Claim 17 above, and further in view of Kiridena and Hassinger, US 3915385.

Ramakesavan, Henley, Akinori, Okude and Kiridena do not specifically teach a way to keep the camera lenses clean. However, it would have been obvious to design such a system because the environment in which the automobile optical system is subjected to (snow and grime in the winter, if in the Northeast, rain, if in the Northwest or dust if in the

Southwest) is harsh and to provide undistorted image data the camera lenses must be free of dirt, etc.

Hassinger teaches:

providing a source of air (figure 4, element 18);

disposing said source of air within said vehicle (Figure 1, element 18);

Hassinger then uses a switch (Column 2, Lines 47-48) instead of a voice command causing air to be applied to at least on of said plurality of cameras by use of said generated second voice command (Column 2, Line 65, Column 3, Line 4).

Ramakesavan, Henley, Akinori, Okude and Hassinger do not teach voice commands. However, Kiridena teaches using a voice command to control the system (Column 6, Lines 27-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the lens cleaning system of Hassinger with the camera system of Ramakesavan, Henley, Akinori, Okude and Kiridena because Hassinger is familiar with keeping lenses on automobiles clean. Additionally, such systems are already part of an automobile system, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use already designed off-the-shelf lens cleaning systems to provide unobstructed image acquisition. Furthermore, the use of a voice command system would allow the vehicle operator to maintain his/her attention on the task of driving instead of looking for a switch or icon.

As per Claim 20, Hassinger teaches:

providing a cleansing agent (Column 6, Lines 23-32);

heating said cleansing agent; mixing said air with said heated cleansing agent; (see figure element 18, which shows cleansing agent liquid located in the engine compartment

of an automobile). Hassinger by locating the cleansing agent liquid in the engine compartment insures that the liquid will be warmed by the heat energy created by the engine.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the engine heat to elevate the temperature of the cleansing agent, at least, to prevent freezing of the cleansing solution in the line.

applying said mixture of said air and said heated cleaning agent to said at least one of said plurality of cameras (Figure 4, element 18, co1 2, Lines 54-60, air and fluid are mixed in tank 18).

Contact Information

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mehrdad Dastouri whose telephone number is (703) 305-2438. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au can be reached on (703) 308-6604. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MEHRDAD DASTOURI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Mehrdad Dastouri

Mehrdad Dastouri
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2623
March 22, 2004